Saskatchewan
Ministry of
Tourism, Parks,
Culture and Sport

HISTORIC PLACES IN SASKATCHEWAN MUNICIPALITIES

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Prepared by:

Evaluation Unit
Ministry of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport

October 2008

Saskatchewan Heritage

Canada's Historic Places | Lieux patrimoniaux du Canada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	2
1. Introduction	4
1.1 Methodology	4
2. Overall Results	6
2.1 Respondent Demographics	6
2.2 What Do Municipalities Have?	7
2.3 What Are Municipalities Doing?	8
2.4 Awareness and Use of Provincial and Federal Resources	10
2.5 Benefits and Outcomes of Protecting and Promoting Historic Places	12
2.6 Municipality Limits and Leverage	12
2.7 Views of Support from Government and Other Organizations	13
3. Comparisons by Community Type	14
3.1 What Do Municipalities Have?	14
3.2 What Are Municipalities Doing?	16
3.3 Awareness and Use of Provincial and Federal Resources	19
3.4 Benefits and Outcomes of Protecting and Promoting Historic Places	19
3.5 Municipality Limits and Leverage	20
3.6 Views of Support from Government and Other Organizations	23
4. Appendix A: Historic Places in Saskatchewan Municipalities Survey with Results	24

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to understand the activities municipalities are engaged in to protect or promote historic places within their jurisdictions. This study was also designed to obtain information to assist the Ministry of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport in developing benchmarks related to heritage conservation and support the development of tools and programs for municipal engagement and capacity building.

The questionnaire was administered to municipal contacts using two methods: 1) Directed email invitations to an online survey; and 2) Standard mail invitations accompanied by a paper survey. This survey approach resulted in a total of 353 completed surveys and a response rate of 47.3 per cent.

Overall Results

The majority of respondents indicated that their municipality had some type of historic place. The most common places identified were: 1) Cemeteries; 2) Religious buildings; and 3) Public buildings. Most of the respondents were aware that historic places could be designated as Municipal Heritage Property (MHP). Of those, the majority indicated that their municipality had designated a historic place as a MHP.

A small proportion of respondents indicated that the protection of historic places was a high to very high priority for their municipal government. One-quarter of respondents indicated that their municipality had a full-time municipal staff person regularly involved with historic places. The findings also suggest that municipalities rely heavily on external organizations and individuals to protect and promote historic places, particularly volunteers.

Less than half of the respondents indicated that their municipality had recognized a historic place (e.g., on-site plaque, sign or cairn). An even smaller proportion of respondents indicated that their municipality kept a current list or inventory of local historic places.

The findings suggest that only a small proportion of municipalities have provided financial incentives to protect or promote historic places, with grants and tax relief/abatement reported most commonly. The results also suggest that a small proportion of municipalities have provided in-kind contributions, which commonly included labour, site clean-up, or equipment.

Very few respondents indicated that their municipality had any type of heritage resource management plan. A slightly larger proportion of respondents indicated that their municipality monitored the condition of historic places, regulated changes to historic places, or had adopted policies or bylaws for the reuse, rehabilitation, or protection of historic places.

With the exception of the Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation and the *Heritage Property Act*, a small proportion of respondents were aware of federal and provincial resources available to protect or promote historic places. An even smaller proportion of respondents indicated that people in their municipality had used these resources. Respondents indicated that they were most likely to use resources from the Government of Saskatchewan and Tourism Saskatchewan to seek assistance for the protection and promotion of historic places.

The majority of respondents agreed that historic places are a source of pride for residents in their municipality. However, a small proportion of respondents reported that historic places

attract tourists to their community and even fewer reported that historic places attract new businesses to their community.

The results suggest that municipalities lack the capacity to protect or promote historic places, particularly financial and human resources. Almost three-quarters of respondents indicated that training or assistance related to identifying and obtaining financial resources would be quite or very useful.

Generally, the results suggest that respondents were not satisfied with how well municipal, provincial and federal governments perform in helping protect and promote historic places. However, the majority of respondents agreed that Tourism Saskatchewan did a good job helping promote historic places.

Comparisons by Community Type

Comparisons were made by community type based on three groups: 1) Village, which included villages, resort villages, and northern villages (n=141); 2) Town, which included towns and northern towns (n=83); and 3) Rural municipality (RM), which included rural municipalities (n=116). Cities were excluded from statistical comparisons due to the small number of respondents from cities (n=10), however the results for cities are presented in Section-3 of this report for informational purposes.

Generally, towns appeared to have more types of historic places than villages and RMs. The findings also suggest that individuals, groups and organizations were more active in protecting and promoting historic places in towns than villages and RMs. Respondents from towns were also more likely than respondents from villages and RMs to indicate that their municipality had a full-time municipal staff person regularly involved in heritage activities.

The findings suggest that towns were more active than villages and RMs in heritage protection and promotion activities, particularly in providing financial and in-kind support. Respondents from towns and RMs were more likely than respondents from villages to indicate that their municipality recognized a historic place and kept a current inventory of historic places.

A higher proportion of respondents from towns and RMs were aware of federal and provincial resources to protect and promote historic places compared to respondents from villages. Respondents from towns were more likely than respondents from villages and RMs to use resources from Tourism Saskatchewan, heritage organizations, and local contractors/consultants in order to seek assistance related to protecting and promoting historic places.

Respondents from towns, villages, and RMs were most likely to agree that historic places are a source of pride for local residents.

The findings suggest that both financial and human resources were major barriers to protecting and promoting historic places for towns, villages, and RMs. Identifying and obtaining financial assistance was the most common area of training or assistance reported by respondents from towns, villages and RMs.

A higher proportion of respondents from towns agreed that the municipal government does a good job of promoting historic places compared to respondents from villages and RMs.

1. INTRODUCTION

Previous research has demonstrated that the conservation and promotion of historic places can have real economic, environment and social benefits. Rehabilitating historic buildings, for example, is generating diverse new jobs, revitalizing older neighborhoods, increasing property values, creating affordable housing, and increasing tax revenues. Compared to demolition and new development, historic building rehabilitation and reuse is also reducing landfill wastes, saving energy, and even decreasing our contribution to climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Finally, historic places that are conserved and promoted increase residents' pride in their communities and draw tourists. In fact, studies report that heritage tourists typically stay longer and spend more than average tourists.

Municipal governments are key players in protecting and promoting Saskatchewan's historic places. They possess the knowledge about local heritage resources, and are connected with local individuals and organizations that can help conserve and promote historic places. Under *The Heritage Property Act* and *The Planning and Development Act*, municipal governments are also empowered to regulate, protect and promote local heritage resources.

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport recognizes that the spirit and character of a province is largely defined by its unique history and heritage. All around us, heritage places tell the story of the land and the people and the building of communities. Heritage resources reflect our collective history, define the very places where we all live and work, and help us to better understand ourselves. More than reminders of our collective past, heritage resources have demonstrable social, economic, educational, and other value that is vital to our collective future.

The Heritage Resources Branch (HRB) was officially formed in 1978. Its mission is to facilitate the protection and conservation of heritage resources in Saskatchewan, and to foster a culture of heritage stewardship that will help build sustainable communities. This mandate is accomplished principally through inventory, regulatory, research, and consultative programs and services.

The purpose of this study was to understand the activities municipalities are engaged in to protect or promote historic places within their jurisdictions. This study was also designed to obtain information to assist the Ministry of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport in developing benchmarks related to heritage conservation and support the development of tools and programs for municipal engagement and capacity building.

This report presents the results of a Historic Places in Saskatchewan Municipalities Survey that was developed to understand the current activities and interests of Saskatchewan municipalities related to protecting and promoting historic places. The results are presented in this report in two sections: 1) Overall descriptive results; and 2) Comparisons of three groups based on community type.

1.1 Methodology

The questionnaire was developed collaboratively between the Evaluation Unit and Heritage Resources Branch of the Ministry of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport. It was based on a review of literature and existing instruments related to heritage conservation. In addition, input on the questionnaire and survey methodology was received from the Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs.

The questionnaire was administered to 747 municipal contacts, provided by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs. Two approaches were taken to recruit municipal contacts to participate in the study: 1) Directed email invitations; and 2) Standard mail invitations. Municipal contacts who returned a completed questionnaire were entered into a non-monetary prize draw for one of two season entry passes for Saskatchewan Provincial Parks.

1.1.1 Directed Email Invitations

A total of 621 municipal contacts were directly emailed an invitation to participate in the historic places online survey. Municipal contacts were also sent up to three reminders to complete the survey. The email invitations and reminders all had an embedded link to the online survey.

Due to complications identified with the Government server, which prevented the majority of emails from being delivered, municipal contacts were also mailed a paper version of the survey, accompanied with a cover letter and a postage-paid return envelope. The complications with the Government server have since been resolved. This process resulted in a total of 281 completed surveys and a response rate of 45.2 per cent.

1.1.2 Standard Mail Invitations

A total of 126 municipal contacts were mailed a paper version of the historic places survey. Municipal contacts were also sent reminders (i.e., postcard reminder and replacement survey) based on Dillman's total design method (2000). This process resulted in a total of 72 completed surveys and a response rate of 57.6 per cent (excluded one bad mailing address).

Data was collected during March through May of 2008. Combining both sets of respondents resulted in an overall response rate of 47.3 per cent.

Table 1.1 – Response Rate by Community Type

	Completed Surveys	Number of Contacts	Response Rate
City	10	15	66.7%
Town	80	151	53.0%
Village	120	233	51.5%
Rural Municipality	116	283	41.0%
Resort Village	14	36	38.9%
Northern Community	10	28[1]	35.7%
Northern Town	*3*		
Northern Village	*7*		
Unknown	3		
TOTAL	**353**	**746[1]**	**47.3%**

[1] *Excluded one bad mailing address.*

The Evaluation Unit of the Ministry of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport was responsible for the administration and analysis of the historic places survey. All identifiers were removed immediately to protect the privacy of the survey respondents.

2. OVERALL RESULTS

This section of the report provides highlights of the overall results from the historic places survey. The detailed results can be found in Appendix A.

2.1 Respondent Demographics

2.1.1 Gender

The majority of respondents (72.9%) were female.

2.1.2 Aboriginal Status

A very small proportion of respondents (3.5%) were Aboriginal.

2.1.3 Education

The majority of respondents (56.7%) completed a post-secondary certificate or diploma, while a much smaller proportion (12.5%) had completed a bachelor's degree.

2.1.4 Municipality Size

The majority of respondents (68.4%) were from a municipality of 500 people or less. One-quarter of respondents (24.6%) were from a municipality of 501 to 2,000 people.

2.1.5 Municipality Type

There was a reasonable level of variation in respondents' type of municipality.

- Village: 34.3% (n=120)
- Rural Municipality: 33.1% (n=116)
- Town: 22.9% (n=80)
- Resort Village: 4.0% (n=14)
- Northern Community: 2.9% (n=10)
- City: 2.9% (n=10)

2.1.6 Employment

The majority of respondents (59.0%) were full-time municipal staff. A much smaller proportion of respondents were part-time municipal staff (25.3%) and municipally-elected officials (9.9%). Of those employed by the municipality, the average (mean[1]) number of years respondents had been in their current position was 10.2 years (median[2]: 7.0 years).

2.1.7 Time Spent on Activities Related to Historic Places

A small proportion of respondents (15.9%) spent at least some paid-time on activities related to protecting or promoting historic places in a typical week during May to September. Of those respondents, the average (mean) amount of time spent on activities related to historic places in a typical week was 6.2 hours. (median: 2.0 hours). During October to April, a lower proportion of respondents (12.2%) spent at least some paid-time on activities related to historic places (mean: 7.0 hours; median: 1.0 hours).

A small proportion of respondents (37.5%) spent at least some time in the past year volunteering on activities related to protecting or promoting historic places. On average (mean) respondents spent 35.9 hours in the past year volunteering on activities related to protecting or promoting historic places (median: 10.0 hours).

---

[1] The mean represents the mathematical average of the scores/responses.
[2] The median is the point below which fifty percent of the scores/responses fall.

2.2 What Do Municipalities Have?

2.2.1 Types of Historic Places

The five most common types of places cited by respondents as being important to their municipality's heritage or history were:

1) Cemeteries (77.7%);
2) Religious buildings (71.5%);
3) Public buildings (66.9%);
4) Structures (e.g., bridges, water towers, monuments, cairns) (52.8%); and
5) Homes (50.6%).

2.2.2 Historic Places at Risk

The majority of respondents (54.6%) indicated that there were no historic places in their municipality at risk of being unused or demolished within the next 10 years.

2.2.3 Designated Municipal Heritage Properties

Nearly three-quarters (73.5%) of respondents were aware that historic places could be designated as Municipal Heritage Property (MHP). Of those respondents, the majority (57.0%) indicated that their municipality had designated properties (Within past 10 years: 34.0%; Over 10 years ago: 23.0%). The average (mean) number of historic places identified by each respondent was 3.1 (median=2.0).

Respondent from a village

"We had a former convent declared a Heritage Site. Since then we now use this facility as a town office building. We have the municipal office, post office, library, hair salon, esthetics salon, bistro, dance and judo school, tanning salon and the first municipal daycare in the province. We are very proud of this facility. I know if the council had not taken the steps to declare this as a heritage site, it would have been destroyed."

2.2.4 Designated Municipal Heritage Properties at Risk

The majority of respondents (68.0%) were not aware of any designated places in their municipality that were at risk of being unused or demolished within the next 10 years.

2.2.5 Municipal Staff

One-quarter of respondents (25.1%) indicated that their municipality had at least one full-time paid municipal staff who is regularly involved in protecting or promoting historic places (mean: 1.4 staff; median: 1.0 staff). A slightly smaller proportion of respondents (20.7%) indicated that their municipality had at least one part-time paid municipal staff regularly involved in protecting or promoting historic places (mean: 1.5 staff; median: 1.0 staff).

2.2.6 Individuals and Organization

Respondents were asked to rate, based on a four-point scale, how active several groups and organizations were in protecting or promoting historic places in their municipality. The four groups or organizations with the highest ratings (somewhat to very active) were:

1) Individual volunteers (65.5%);
2) Local museum (49.7%);
3) Community/economic development (37.8%); and
4) Tourism (37.5%).

Respondent from a town
"Our local museum is instrumental at collecting items, as well as refurbishing the teacherage and one-room school house back to its original state."

The three most commonly identified individuals involved in the protection or promotion of historic places were:

1) Individual volunteers (48.3%);
2) Individuals from heritage groups (35.3%); and
3) Municipal elected officials (21.4%).

Respondent from an RM
"The local residents banded together to ensure a historic cairn was placed to commemorate a historic trading site. The interest generated and persistence of the local residents contributed to the success."

2.2.7 Municipal Heritage Advisory Committees

Very few respondents (3.0%) indicated that their municipality had a Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee (MHAC). Of those respondents (88.9%) who indicated that their municipality did not have a MHAC, only nine percent (9.4%) indicated that their municipality would be interested in creating one.

2.3 What Are Municipalities Doing?

2.3.1 Activities to Protect or Promote Historic Places

The five most frequently reported activities that municipalities have undertaken to protect or promote their heritage within the past 5 years were:

1) Museum displays or exhibits (38.8%);
2) Heritage promotion (32.5%);
3) Maintenance or minor repairs to a historic place (31.7%);
4) Tours of local historic places (25.0%); and
5) Publication of books, brochures, or other materials (24.7%).

Respondent from a village
"At our Centennial Homecoming, we researched each property in the village and made signs showing who had lived in the house as far back as we could trace the history. We have marked the old rural schools in our area. We also created a History Wall that has over 1,000 pictures of the pioneer families, the old businesses, homes, churches, and schools, as well as old farming equipment."

2.3.2 Recognition of Historic Places

Almost half of respondents (46.7%) indicated that their municipality had recognized a historic place, aside from designation as a MHP. Of those respondents who indicated that their municipality had recognized a historic place, the three most frequently cited ways of recognizing were:

1) On-site plaque, sign or cairn (84.7%);
2) Listing in a brochure or other publication (31.2%); and
3) Placing on a website (28.7%).

Of those respondents who indicated that their municipality has recognized a historic place, a very small proportion (10.5%) indicated that their municipality had criteria for recognizing historic places. Of those that did have criteria, the most commonly reported criteria were:

1) Religious significance (75.0%);
2) Age of place (75.0%); and
3) Social or cultural significance (75.0%).

2.3.3 Inventory of Historic Places

Almost one-quarter of respondents (24.1%) indicated that their municipality kept a current list or inventory of their local historic places. Of the respondents who indicated that their municipality kept a list or inventory, the most common types of information included were:

1) Name of place (85.7%);
2) Address, location or legal description (84.5%); and
3) Designation as a Municipal Heritage Property (76.2%).

2.3.4 Financial Support

More than one-third of respondents (36.7%) were aware that the *Heritage Property Act* enabled municipalities to provide grants, loans, tax relief and other forms of financial assistance to protect or promote historic places.

The most commonly cited sources of financial assistance that municipalities have been asked to provide to support the protection or promotion of historic places were:

1) Grants (20.1%);
2) Tax relief or abatement (18.4%); and
3) Other one-time funding (15.6%).

Similarly, the most frequently cited sources of financial assistance municipalities have provided were:

1) Tax relief or abatement (16.9%);
2) Grants (16.8%); and
3) Other one-time funding (15.7%).

A small proportion of respondents (17.6%) indicated that their municipality had spent at least some money to protect or promote historic places in the past year. Of those, the average (mean) amount of money spent per municipality was $5,815 (median: $1,000).

A large majority of respondents (75.6%) indicated that they expected the amount of money spent by their municipality on protecting and promoting historic places to stay the same. A considerably smaller proportion (18.8%) indicated that the amount of money would increase.

A small proportion of respondents (16.3%) indicated that someone in their municipality had applied to an external funding agency within the past 10 years for support to protect or promote historic places. Commonly reported external funding agencies or programs included the Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation, Canada Celebrates Saskatchewan/Saskatchewan Centennial Grants, and community sponsors.

2.3.5 In-Kind Contributions

The three most commonly reported in-kind contributions provided by municipalities to protect or promote historic places were:

1) Labour (38.4%);
2) Site clean-up (32.9%); and
3) Equipment (20.4%).

2.3.6 Sources of Promotion

The five most frequently cited sources used to promote historic places were:

1) Roadside signage or displays (36.5%);
2) Internet or website (34.5%);
3) Printed brochures or guides (32.9%);
4) Tourism Saskatchewan resources (26.9%); and
5) Guided tours (23.0%).

2.3.7 Municipal Planning

A small proportion of respondents (15.2%) indicated that the protection of historic places was a priority (high or very high priority) for their municipal government.

> **Respondent from an RM**
> *"As a single person office we struggle to find time for general government, transportation, protective and environmental issues."*

Just over one-quarter of respondents (26.6%) indicated that their municipality had an Official Community Plan. Of those respondents who indicated their municipality had an Official Community Plan, one-quarter (25.0%) indicated that the plan contains aspects related to the protection or promotion of historic places.

Respondents were asked whether their municipality had any of four potential types of stand-alone plans to protect or promote historic places. The most commonly reported plans were:

1) Informal or unwritten heritage resource management plan (7.8%); and
2) Site-specific heritage resource management plan (6.2%).

A small proportion of respondents (17.6%) indicated that their municipality had adopted policies or bylaws for the reuse, rehabilitation, or protection of historic places.

> **Respondent from an RM**
> *"On two occasions the RM passed a heritage designation bylaw, so that a local heritage committee could preserve and protect heritage properties."*

Almost a third of respondents (28.8%) indicated that their municipality regulated changes to historic places that are designated as MHP. A slightly higher proportion of respondents (38.0%) indicated that their municipality monitored the condition of historic places designated as MHP.

A very small proportion of respondents (3.0%) indicated that their municipality regulated changes to places that are not designated as MHP.

2.4 Awareness and Use of Provincial and Federal Resources

2.4.1 Saskatchewan's Heritage Property Act

Two-thirds of respondents (65.9%) were aware of Saskatchewan's *Heritage Property Act.*

2.4.2 Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation

The majority of respondents (53.9%) indicated that they were aware of the Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation.

2,4.3 Conserving Your Historic Places – A Guide for Communities

Over one-third of respondents (36.2%) indicated that they were aware of *Conserving Your Historic Places – A Guide for Communities*. Of those respondents who were aware, less than one-quarter (23.3%) indicated that someone in their municipality had used the Guide. Of those who identified that the Guide had been used, the most frequently cited uses were assisting with:

1) Designating a historic place as a Municipal Heritage Property (50.0%);
2) Assessing and/or describing the heritage value of a place (36.7%); and
3) Recognizing a historic place (26.7%).

2.4.4 Historic Places Initiative

Almost one-quarter of respondents (23.4%) were aware of the Historic Places Initiative.

2.4.5 Canadian Register of Historic Places

Less than one-third of respondents (30.3%) were aware of the Canadian Register of Historic Places. Of those respondents who were aware, over one-quarter (26.5%) indicated that someone in their municipality had used the Canadian Register. The most common uses identified by respondents were:

1) To find out information about historic places in the local municipality (56.7%);
2) To learn more about protecting historic places (53.3%); and
3) To find out information about historic places outside of the municipality (43.3%).

2.4.6 Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

Almost a quarter of respondents (24.3%) were aware of the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada. Of those respondents who were aware, over one-third (34.6%) indicated that someone in their municipality had used the Standards and Guidelines. The most frequently cited uses were:

1) As a resource for regulating alterations to a designated heritage property (51.9%);
2) To provide heritage conservation advice to members of their community (44.4%); and
3) As a guide when making alterations to a historic place (40.7%).

None of the respondents who were aware of the Standards and Guidelines indicated that their municipality had adopted the Standards and Guidelines to guide the regulation of alterations to historic places.

2.4.7 Use of Resources

Respondents were asked how likely they would be to use resources from a number of groups or organizations in order to seek assistance for the protection or promotion of historic places. The four groups or organizations with the highest ratings (quite or very likely) were:

1) Government of Saskatchewan (71.9%);
2) Tourism Saskatchewan (67.3%);
3) Federal government (57.6%); and
4) Local heritage organizations (49.5%).

2.5 Benefits and Outcomes of Protecting and Promoting Historic Places

2.5.1 Benefits to the Community

The majority of respondents (58.7%) agreed that historic places are a source of pride for residents. A smaller proportion of respondents (40.7%) agreed that historic places in their community attract tourists. Less than ten percent of respondents (7.3%) agreed that historic places in their community attract new businesses.

Nearly half of respondents (48.5%) agreed that residents appreciate the value of historic places in their community. However, a considerably smaller proportion of respondents (12.8%) agreed that residents understand the importance of historic places to the local economy.

> **Respondent from a town**
> *"We created a Friends of the Mill to save, develop and promote the old flour mill. This has opened the eyes of many who thought the best solution was to [tear it down]. Now it is a source of pride for our community."*

2.5.2 Outcomes of Protection and Promotion Activities

From a list of six outcomes, respondents were asked to indicate the likeliness (on a five-point scale) that each outcome would result if a municipality was actively involved in protecting or promoting historic places. The three outcomes with the highest ratings (quite to very likely) were:

1) Increased support for bylaws or policies to protect or promote historic places (39.7%);
2) Revitalization of older areas and/or neighbourhoods (20.1%); and
3) Waste reduction, including reduction in landfill waste (12.1%).

2.6 Municipality Limits and Leverage

2.6.1 Limits to Protection and Promotion of Historic Places

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with eight potential factors that may have limited their municipality's ability to protect or promote local historic places. The three most frequently cited factors were:

1) Lack of municipal financial resources (78.8%);
2) Lack of external financial resources (72.4%); and
3) Lack of municipal staff resources (71.3%).

> **Respondent from a village**
> *"For many small centres protecting historic places is virtually impossible due to small pools of volunteers and limited funds. Effective preservation strategies need to take all of these issues into account."*

2.6.2 Limits to Designation as a Municipal Heritage Property

The four most frequently cited reasons for not designating historic places as MHP were: 1) Lack of municipal staff resources (55.3%); 2) Property owners are not interested (34.1%); 3) Designation is too restrictive for developers or owners (32.2%); and 4) It costs too much money (31.4%).

2.6.3 Municipal Resource Capacity

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with a number of statements related to resources available to assist in the protection and promotion of historic places. A large majority of respondents (81.1%) indicated that municipalities need more financial support to adequately protect local historic places. The results also highlight a lack of volunteer capacity to protect or promote historic places, as well as a lack of easy access to information. Nearly half of respondents (45.2%) reported that it is difficult to find trades/contractors to work on historic places. The findings also highlight a lack of collaboration between municipal governments and local businesses in protecting or promoting historic places.

2.6.4 Leverage through Training and Assistance

Respondents were asked how useful (on a five-point scale) it would be for municipal staff and other heritage workers and volunteers to receive training or assistance in several areas. The five areas with the highest ratings (quite to very useful) were:

1) Identifying and obtaining financial assistance to protect or promote historic places (71.7%);
2) Promoting historic places to residents and tourists (59.0%);
3) Finding new ways to use historic places (58.4%);
4) Engaging residents in protecting/promoting historic places (57.3%); and
5) Rehabilitating, restoring, or preserving historic places (56.5%).

Respondent from a town
"Consultants that could come out to help plan better uses of our facilities, so we as volunteers could work to get the best possible use out of the historical buildings we have."

2.6.5 Priority Level of Projects to Protect Historic Places

On a five-point scale, respondents were asked to rate the priority level of several projects that could be undertaken in order to prevent historic places from being unused or demolished. The three projects with the highest priority ratings (high to very high priority) were:

1) Repairs to building envelope (41.6%);
2) Structural upgrades (26.3%); and
3) Mechanical upgrades (22.2%).

2.7 Views of Support from Government and Other Organizations

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with several statements related to how well governments and other organizations assist in protecting and promoting historic places. The results suggest that respondents were not satisfied with how well municipal, provincial, and federal governments perform in helping protect and promote historic places. However, the majority of respondents (52.6%) indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that Tourism Saskatchewan does a good job of helping promote historic places.

Respondent from a city
"The Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation has been excellent in assisting [our city] with ensuring that the [city] hall is kept in acceptable condition. Staff from the Foundation is very helpful with our needs."

Respondent from a village
"Not enough interest in dying rural areas – the government doesn't care or have the monetary funding."

3. COMPARISONS BY COMMUNITY TYPE

The following section presents the results of comparisons by community type, based on the following three groups:

1) Village – includes villages, resort villages and northern villages (n=141);
2) Town – includes towns and northern towns (n=83); and
3) Rural Municipality (RM) – includes rural municipalities (n=116).

Only the results of variables that are statistically different are presented below. Cities were excluded from statistical comparisons in this section due to the small number of respondents from cities (n=10). However, results for cities are presented below for informational purposes. Any differences between cities and the other three groups should not be considered statistically significant.

3.1 What do Municipalities Have?

3.1.1 Types of Historic Places

Comparisons were made with the types of places that are important to a municipality's heritage by community type. There were significant differences with 7 of the 11 types of places. The findings suggest that towns were more likely than villages and RMs to have public buildings, commercial buildings, homes, structures, and parks, landscapes or other spaces. A higher proportion of respondents from RMs reported having cemeteries and archaeological sites compared to towns and villages. Generally, cities appear to have as many or more types of historic places than towns, villages, and RMs.

Table 3.1.1 – Types of Historic Places by Community Type

	Town	Village	RM	*City*[1]
Public buildings (e.g., town hall, school)	83.3%	63.1%	63.0%	*90.0%*
Commercial buildings (e.g., businesses, warehouses, elevators)	71.9%	59.1%	36.0%	*87.5%*
Homes	74.2%	58.2%	40.6%	*100%*
Cemeteries	81.2%	67.0%	92.0%	*100%*
Archaeological sites	12.0%	5.6%	28.6%	*50.0%*
Parks, landscapes, or other spaces	59.7%	37.6%	49.4%	*71.4%*
Structures (e.g., bridges, water towers, monuments, cairns)	73.8%	37.8%	61.0%	*100%*

**Percent of respondents who indicated that their municipality had at least one place.*
[1]City was excluded from statistical comparison due to small number of respondents (n=10).

3.1.2 Historic Places at Risk

A higher proportion of respondents (52.6%) from towns reported that their municipality had at least one historic place at risk of being unused or demolished compared to respondents from villages (37.3%) and RMs (27.8%). Nearly three-quarters of respondents (70.0%) from cities reported having at least one historic place at risk.

3.1.3 Designated Municipal Heritage Property

A higher proportion of respondents from RMs (84.8%) and towns (81.7%) were aware that historic places could be designated as Municipal Heritage Property (MHP) compared to respondents from villages (56.7%). All of the respondents from cities were aware that places could be designated as MHP.

Respondents from RMs (71.3%) and towns (64.5%) were more likely than respondents from villages (43.8%) to have at least one place designated as a MHP. Of those that had a property, on average (mean), towns (2.1) and RMs (2.0) had more places designated than villages (1.4). All of the respondents from cities indicated that their municipality had at least one place designated as a MHP (mean: 15.0).

3.1.4 Municipal Staff Regularly Involved with Historic Places

Comparisons were made by community type with: 1) Whether the municipality had at least one full-time staff person regularly involved in protecting or promoting historic places; and 2) Whether the municipality had at least one part-time staff person regularly involved in protecting or promoting historic places. There were no significant differences by part-time staff. Respondents from towns (37.5%) were more likely than respondents from villages (20.4%) and RMs (18.2%) to indicate that their municipality had at least one full-time staff person. The majority of respondents from cities (60.0%) indicated that their municipality had at least one full-time staff person regularly involved in heritage.

3.1.5 Local Groups and Organizations Involved with Historic Places

Comparisons were made by community type with how active several groups or organizations were in protecting or promoting historic places. There were significant differences with eight of the nine groups or organizations. The findings suggest that groups and organizations were more active in protecting and promoting historic places in towns than villages and RMs. Overall, cities appeared to have the most active local groups and organizations.

Table 3.1.5 – Involvement of Local Groups and Organizations with Historic Places by Community Type

	Towns	Villages	RMs	*City*[1]
Local museum	82.3%	28.7%	49.5%	*90.0%*
Friends of a historic site	29.0%	10.8%	26.2%	*90.0%*
Historical society	29.6%	5.6%	29.6%	*77.8%*
Genealogical society	18.3%	0.9%	9.2%	*83.3%*
Local archives	34.4%	11.1%	12.8%	*77.8%*
Community/economic development	64.8%	20.9%	42.5%	*77.8%*
Tourism	69.0%	20.9%	37.6%	*100%*
Individual volunteer(s)	87.1%	59.3%	75.3	*100%*

**Percent of respondents who indicated 'Somewhat Active' to 'Very Active'*

[1]City was excluded from statistical comparison due to small number of respondents (n=10).

3.1.6 Other Individuals Involved with Historic Places

Comparisons were made by community type with the types of individuals who are involved in protecting or promoting historic places. There were significant differences with 6 of the 10 types of individual involvement. Respondents from towns were more likely than respondents from villages and RMs to indicate that each type of individual was involved in protecting or promoting

historic places in their municipality. Overall, cities appear to be most likely to have individuals involved with protecting or promoting historic places.

Table 3.1.6 – Individuals Involved with Historic Places by Community Type

	Towns	Villages	RMs	City[1]
Individual(s) from heritage group(s)	52.5%	19.8%	36.7%	*80.0%*
Municipal elected official	36.2%	18.2%	11.9%	*50.0%*
Individual(s) from other groups(s)	37.5%	9.1%	15.6%	*50.0%*
Other municipal staff (not dedicated to heritage planning)	28.8%	5.8%	11.9%	*30.0%*
Local business person(s)	15.0%	5.0%	2.8%	*40.0%*
MHAC Members	6.2%	0.8%	0.0%	*60.6%*

**Percent of respondents who indicated 'Yes'.*
[1]City was excluded from statistical comparison due to small number of respondents (n=10).

3.2 What Are Municipalities Doing?

3.2.1 Activities to Protect or Promote Historic Places

Comparisons were made by community type with the types of activities municipalities have undertaken in the past five years to protect or promote heritage. There were significant differences with 9 of the 12 activities. Overall, the findings suggest that towns were more active than villages and RMs in heritage protection and promotion activities. Cities appeared to be the quite active in heritage activities.

Table 3.2.1 – Activities the Municipality has Undertaken in the Past Five Years by Community Type

	Town	Village	RM	City[1]
Heritage promotion	49.4%	21.3%	30.2%	*80.0%*
Tours of local historic places	43.4%	14.7%	19.8%	*80.0%*
Education and Children's programs	25.3%	11.0%	10.3%	*80.0%*
Publication of books. brochures, etc.	42.2%	20.6%	12.9%	*80.0%*
Museum displays/exhibits	74.7%	26.5%	23.3%	*90.0%*
Research or collections of materials	37.3%	14.7%	17.2%	*50.0%*
Renovated a historic place for a new use	15.7%	7.4%	6.0	*40.0%*
Restored a historic place	20.5%	5.9%	10.3%	*10.0%*
Performed maintenance or repair to a historic place	48.2%	21.5%	25.9%	*100.0%*

**Percent of respondents who indicated 'Yes'.*
[1]City was excluded from statistical comparison due to small number of respondents (n=10).

3.2.2 Recognition of Historic Places

Respondents from towns (61.1%) and RMs (62.0%) were more likely than respondents from villages (36.8%) to indicate that their municipality had recognized a historic place. All of the respondents from cities indicated that their municipality had recognized a historic place.

3.2.3 Inventory of Historic Places

Respondents from towns (33.8%) and RMs (33.0%) were more likely than respondents from villages (15.4%) to indicate that their municipality kept a current list or inventory. Over two-thirds of respondents (70.0%) from cities indicated that their municipality kept a current list or inventory.

3.2.4 Financial Incentives

Comparisons were made by community type with: 1) Types of financial incentives the municipality has ever been asked to provide; and 2) Types of financial incentives the municipality has ever provided. Four of the six types of financial incentives were significant. Generally, the results suggest that towns were more likely to have been asked to provide financial incentives and more likely to have provided financial incentives than villages and RMs. Overall, cities appear to be more likely to both receive requests and provide financial incentives compared to the other community types.

Table 3.2.4 – Financial Incentives by Community Type

	Municipality has been asked to Provide the Incentive				Municipality has Provided the Incentive			
	Towns	Villages	RMs	*City*[1]	Towns	Villages	RMs	*City*[1]
Grants	43.6%	7.5%	34.9%	*57.1%*	38.3%	7.0%	26.3%	*42.9%*
Tax Relief or Tax Abatement Program	42.1%	18.1%	14.3%	*83.3%*	41.7%	17.8%	12.2%	*60.0%*
Reduction to or waiving of utilities	35.6%	9.6%	1.2%	*50.0%*	34.0%	10.5%	1.4%	*50.0%*
Other One-Time Funding	38.2%	10.6%	18.8%	*50.0%*	33.3%	9.5%	21.1%	*60.0%*

**Percent of respondents who indicated 'Yes'.*
[1]City was excluded from statistical comparison due to small number of respondents (n=10).

3.2.5 Money Spent to Protect or Promote Historic Places

A higher proportion of respondents from towns (28.9%) indicated that their municipality spent at least some money to protect or promote historic places in the past year compared to RMs (15.3%) and villages (9.9%). The findings suggest that of those municipalities that spent at least some money, towns ($7,568) spent more money on average (mean), than RMs ($2,665) and villages ($1,154) in the past year.

The majority of respondents from cities (62.5%) indicated that their municipality spent at least some money to protect or promote historic places in the past year (mean: $20,000).

3.2.6 Application to External Funding Sources

A higher proportion of respondents from towns (46.3%) indicated that someone from their municipality had applied to an external funding source to protect or promote historic places in the past ten years compared to RMs (31.6%) and villages (15.3%). A large majority of respondents from cities (75.0%) indicated that someone from their municipality had applied to an external funding source.

3.2.7 In-Kind Contributions

Comparisons were made with the types of in-kind contributions a municipality had provided by community type. Seven of the eight types of in-kind contributions were significant. Overall,

respondents from towns were more likely to indicate that their municipality had provided in kind-contributions compared to villages and RMs.

In general, a small proportion of respondents from cities indicated that their municipality had provided various in-kind contributions.

Table 3.2.7 - In-Kind Contributions Provided by the Municipality by Community Type

	Towns	Villages	RMs	City[1]
Labour	62.5%	30.3%	28.3%	*50.0%*
Site clean-up or waste removal	48.8%	34.4%	20.4%	*30.0%*
Office space/supplies	17.5%	5.7%	7.1%	*30.0%*
Professional services (advertising, website development, etc.)	26.2%	6.6%	4.4%	*30.0%*
Equipment	31.2%	12.3%	22.1%	*20.0%*
Building materials/supplies	26.2%	9.8%	4.4%	*30.0%*
Other material/supplies	22.5%	4.9%	4.4%	*10.0%*

**Percent of respondents who indicated that their municipality has provided the contribution.*
[1]City was excluded from statistical comparison due to small number of respondents (n=10).

3.2.8 Sources of Promotion

Comparisons by community type were made with sources municipalities have used to promote historic places. There were significant differences with six of the nine sources of promotion. Generally, the results suggest that towns use each of the sources more than villages and RMs.

Cities appear to use each source of promotion as much or more than towns, villages and RMs.

Table 3.2.8 – Sources of Promotion by Community Type

	Towns	Villages	RMs	City[1]
Printed brochures or guides	61.7%	22.7%	17.7%	*100%*
Internet/website	65.4%	26.9%	15.9%	*90.0%*
Roadside signage/displays	47.5%	21.2%	44.2%	*50.0%*
Newspaper/magazine advertising or articles	30.0%	12.6%	7.1%	*60.0%*
Guided tours	41.2%	12.8%	15.0%	*90.0%*
Tourism Saskatchewan (e.g. website, brochures, maps, etc.)	41.2%	20.3%	22.1%	*50.0%*

**Percent of respondents who indicated that their municipality used the source.*
[1]City was excluded from statistical comparison due to small number of respondents (n=10).

3.2.9 Municipal Planning

Respondents from towns (41.7%) were more likely than respondents from RMs (29.7%) and villages (20.0%) to indicate that their municipality had an Official Community Plan. The majority of respondents from cities (62.5%) indicated that their municipality had an Official Community Plan.

3.3 Awareness and Use of Provincial and Federal Resources

3.3.1 Saskatchewan's Heritage Property Act

A higher proportion of respondents from RMs (77.0%) and towns (71.1%) were aware of the *Heritage Property Act* compared to respondents from villages (50.0%). All of the respondents from cities were aware of the *Heritage Property Act*.

3.3.2 Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation

A higher proportion of respondents from towns (63.3%) and RMs (57.4%) were aware of the Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation compared to respondents from villages (42.4%). Over three-quarters of the respondents (77.8%) from cities were aware of the Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation.

3.3.3 Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places

A higher proportion of respondents from towns (31.7%) were aware of the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places compared to RMs (22.2%) and villages (16.3%). The majority of respondents from cities (66.7%) were aware of the Standards and Guidelines.

3.3.4 Use of Resources

Comparisons were made by community type with how likely respondents were to use resources from different groups or organizations to help with the protection or promotion of historic places. There were significant differences with four of the nine groups or organizations. Respondents from towns were more likely to use each of the groups or organizations than villages and RMs. The majority of respondents from cities used each of the groups or organizations.

Table 3.3.4 – Likeliness to Use Resources by Community Type

	Towns	Villages	RMs	*City*[1]
Tourism Saskatchewan	81.1%	63.4%	61.4%	*80.0%*
Local heritage organization(s) (e.g., museum, historical society, archives, etc.)	76.4%	39.1%	40.2%	*80.0%*
Local contractor or consultant	43.5%	35.2%	19.0%	*50.0%*
Non-profit heritage organization(s)	43.8%	22.8%	24.5%	*60.0%*

**Percent of respondents who indicated 'Quite Likely' or 'Very Likely'.*
[1]City was excluded from statistical comparison due to small number of respondents (n=10).

3.4 Benefits and Outcomes of Protecting and Promoting Historic Places

3.4.1 Benefits to the Community

Comparisons were made by community type with statements related to respondents' views of the benefits of heritage conservation occurring in their community. There were significant differences with five of the six statements. Respondents from towns, villages and RMs were most likely to agree that historic places are a source of pride for residents. The two benefits with the highest level of agreement by respondents from cities were: 1) Historic places in our community attract tourists (80.0%); and 2) Historic places are a source of pride for residents (80.0%).

Table 3.4.1 – Benefits to the Community by Community Type

	Towns	Villages	RMs	City[1]
Historic places in our community attract tourists	56.1%	29.6%	39.1%	*80.0%*
Historic places in our community attract new businesses	11.1%	2.4%	9.1%	*20.0%*
Historic places are a source of pride for residents	70.4%	52.8%	54.0%	*80.0%*
Residents understand the importance of historic places to the local economy	20.7%	10.7%	8.9%	*20.0%*
In our community, more historic places are being re-used than demolished	40.7%	24.0%	17.3%	*40.0%*

**Percent of respondents who 'Agreed' or 'Strongly Agreed'*
[1]City was excluded from statistical comparison due to small number of respondents (n=10).

3.4.2 Outcomes of Protection and Promotion Activities

Comparisons were made by community type with the degree of likeliness that several outcomes would result if a municipality is actively involved in protecting or promoting historic places. There were significant differences with two of the six outcomes. Overall, respondents from towns were more likely than respondents from villages and RMs to report that the outcomes would result. A small proportion of respondents from cities reported that each of the outcomes would result.

Table 3.4.2 – Outcomes of Protection and Promotion Activities by Community Type

	Towns	Villages	RMs	City[1]
Reduction in energy use	16.7%	6.4%	5.7%	*10.0%*
Waste reduction, including reduction in landfill waste	19.0%	11.2%	6.6%	*30.0%*

**Percent of respondents who indicate 'Quite Likely' or 'Very Likely"*
[1]City was excluded from statistical comparison due to small number of respondents (n=10).

3.5 Municipality Limits and Leverage

3.5.1 Limits to Protection and Promotion of Historic Places

Comparisons by community type were made with factors that have limited a municipality's ability to protect or promote historic places. Only one of the eight factors was significant. Respondents from towns (88.9%) and villages (81.8%) were more likely than respondents from RMs (71.2%) to report lack of municipal financial resources as a factor that had limited their municipality's ability to protect or promote historic places. Half of respondents from cities (50.0%) reported that municipal financial resources were a barrier.

3.5.2 Limits to Designation as a Municipal Heritage Property

Only one of the eight possible barriers to designating a place as a MHP was significant by community type. Respondents from towns (48.5%) were more likely than respondents from villages (27.3%) and RMs (22.5%) to indicate that it costs too much money, as a reason for not designating a place as a MHP. One-third of respondents from cities (33.3%) indicated that it cost too much money to designate a historic place.

3.5.3 Municipal Resource Capacity

Comparisons were made by community type with statements related to respondents' views of their municipality's resource capacity related to heritage protection and promotion. There were significant differences with two of the seven statements. Respondents from towns (38.3%) were more likely than respondents from RMs (25.9%) and villages (19.7%) to agree or strongly agree that their community had a lot of volunteers who protect or promote historic places. Respondents from towns (93.9%) were also more likely than respondents from RMs (76.3%) and villages (75.4%) to agree that municipalities need more financial support to adequately protect local historic places.

A large majority of respondents from cities (70.0%) agreed that their community had a lot of volunteers who protect or promote historic places. All of the respondents from cities agreed that municipalities need more financial support to protect historic places.

Table 3.5.3 – Municipal Resource Capacity by Community Type

	Towns	Villages	RMs	*City*[1]
Our community has a lot of volunteers who protect or promote local historic places	38.3%	19.7%	25.9%	*70.0%*
Municipalities need more financial support to adequately protect local historic places	93.9%	75.4%	76.3%	*100%*

**Percent of respondents who 'Agreed' or 'Strongly Agreed'*
[1]City was excluded from statistical comparison due to small number of respondents (n=10).

3.5.4 Leverage through Training and Assistance

Comparisons were made by community type with how useful training or assistance would be in several areas. There were significant differences with 8 of the 10 areas of assistance. Generally, respondents from towns were more likely than respondents from villages and RMs to rate the areas of assistance as quite or very useful. Similarly, a high proportion of respondents from cities rated the areas of assistance as quite or very useful.

Table 3.5.4 – Usefulness of Training and Assistance by Community Type

	Towns	Villages	RMs	*City*[1]
Researching and determining the heritage value of historic places	58.2%	37.7%	46.4%	*70.0%*
Prioritizing the actions needed to protect historic places	62.5%	38.1%	45.4%	*80.0%*
Rehabilitating, restoring, or preserving historic places	73.1%	47.0%	52.7%	*90.0%*
Developing policies or procedures to protect historic places	62.5%	39.5%	45.9%	*100%*
Identifying and obtaining financial assistance to protect or promote historic places	86.1%	62.4%	68.2%	*100%*
Promoting historic places to residents and tourists	75.0%	48.7%	55.5%	*100%*
Engaging residents in protecting/promoting historic places	68.4%	51.3%	53.6%	*80.0%*
Finding new ways to use historic places	73.7%	49.1%	56.0%	*88.9%*

**Percent of respondents who indicated 'Quite Useful' or 'Very Useful'*
[1]*City was excluded from statistical comparison due to small number of respondents (n=10).*

3.5.5 Priority Level of Projects to Protect Historic Places

Comparisons were made by community type with the level of priority respondents placed on several projects that could be undertaken to protect historic places. There were significant differences with 4 of the 12 types of projects. The project with the highest priority rating for towns, villages, RMs and cities was repairs to the building envelope. Respondents from towns were more likely than respondents from villages and RMs to rate each type of project as a high to very high priority to protect historic places.

Table 3.5.5 – Priority Level of Projects to Protect Historic Places by Community Type

	Towns	Villages	RMs	*City*[1]
Repairs to building envelope (e.g., roof, windows, painting, siding, doors)	57.7%	36.1%	33.3%	*60.0%*
Structural upgrades (e.g., foundation, joists, beams)	43.1%	20.4%	20.0%	*30.0%*
Mechanical upgrades (e.g., electrical, plumbing, heating/cooling)	42.6%	18.9%	9.2%	*30.0%*
Security measures (e.g., fire suppression, theft or vandalism prevention)	25.4%	10.3%	13.8%	*22.2%*

**Percent of respondents who indicated 'High Priority' or 'Very High Priority'*
[1]*City was excluded from statistical comparison due to small number of respondents (n=10).*

3.5.6 Priority of Protecting Historic Places

A higher proportion of respondents from towns (67.5%) reported that the protection of historic places was a medium to very high priority in their municipality compared to respondents from RMs (52.2%) and villages (50.8%). Just over half of the respondents (60.0%) from cities

reported that the protection of historic places was a medium to very high priority in their municipality.

3.6 Views of Support from Government and Other Organizations

Comparisons were made by community type with statements related to respondents' views of government and other organizations in relation to heritage protection and promotion activities. There were significant differences with one of the seven statements. A higher proportion of respondents from towns (34.1%) agreed that the municipal government does a good job of helping promote local historic places compared to respondents from villages (24.2%) and RMs (16.7%). Less than half of the respondents from cities (44.4%) agreed that the municipal government does a good job of helping promote local historic places.

4. APPENDIX A: Historic Places in Saskatchewan Municipalities Survey with Results

This Appendix presents results for all of the questions in the survey. Results are presented in the same order as the survey questionnaire.

Section 1 –Protection and Promotion Activities

1. A municipality may protect or promote its heritage through a variety of activities.

   Please select all of the activities that have taken place in your municipality **within the past 5 years** to protect or promote its heritage. *Please ✓all that apply.*

   38.8% (n=348) Museum displays or exhibits
   32.5% (n=348) Heritage promotion (e.g., communication with visitors, local businesses, residents, etc.)
   31.7% (n=347) Performed maintenance or minor repairs to prevent the deterioration or loss of a historic place
   25.0% (n=348) Tours of local historic places
   24.7% (n=348) Publication of books, brochures, or other materials
   21.8% (n=348) Research or collection of historical materials, including digital archiving
   16.4% (n=348) Education and children's programs
   16.1% (n=348) Heritage festivals and other events (e.g., doors open, re-enactments of historical events)
   11.5% (n=348) Development of municipal policy to protect or promote historic places
   10.9% (n=348) Restored a historic place to its original appearance
   9.8% (n=348) Renovated a historic place for a new use
   9.1% (n=331) Other (respondents identified other activities such as designating a place as a MHP, signage, homecoming celebrations, etc.)

2. How many of each of the following types of places are located in your municipality that are important to its heritage or history? *Please ✓one response for each type of historic place.*

	n	None	1 to 2	3 or More	I Don't Know
Public buildings (e.g., town hall, school)	296	30.4%	51.7%	15.2%	2.7%
Religious buildings (e.g., church, temple, synagogue)	302	26.5%	54.0%	17.5%	2.0%
Commercial buildings (e.g., businesses, warehouses, elevators)	272	41.5%	37.9%	16.2%	4.4%
Homes	263	35.0%	24.7%	25.9%	14.4%
Cemeteries	301	19.3%	52.8%	24.95	3.0%
Archaeological sites	252	69.0%	9.1%	3.2%	18.7%
Palaeontological sites	244	75.0%	4.5%	1.2%	18.7%
Parks, landscapes, or other spaces	260	48.8%	36.5%	8.5%	6.2%
Streetscapes	232	76.3%	6.9%	1.7%	15.1%
Structures (e.g., bridges, water towers, monuments, cairns)	267	40.4%	40.1%	12.7%	6.7%
Other (respondents identified other places such as an airport hangar, ice rink, etc.)	82	63.4%	14.6%	3.7%	18.3%

3. What proportion of historic places located in your municipality is at risk of being unused or demolished within the next 10 years? *Please ✓one response.* **(n=339)**

2.1%	A large majority (i.e. more than 75%)
6.8%	The majority (i.e. 50% to 75%)
7.7%	The minority (i.e. 25% to 49%)
18.6%	A very small amount (i.e. less than 25%)
54.6%	None that I am aware of
10.3%	I Don't Know

4. Does your municipality keep a current list or inventory of local historic places? *Please ✓one response.* **(n=348)**

24.1% Yes **64.1%** No **11.8%** I Don't Know

4a) If **Yes (n=84)**, what information is included in this list or inventory? *Please ✓all that apply.*

85.7%	Name of place
84.5%	Address, location or legal description
76.2%	Designation as a Municipal Heritage Property
46.4%	Original building function
41.7%	Pictures
35.7%	Current building function
34.5%	Dates of construction
27.4%	Connection of historic place to people or events
21.4%	Architecture or building style
21.4%	Owner information
20.2%	Dates of renovation or restoration
17.9%	Building condition
10.7%	Architect or builder
2.4%	Other (respondents identified information such as museum committee list and historic themes)

5. In your opinion, to what degree is the protection of historic places a priority for your municipal government. *Please ✓one response.* **(n=341)**

15.8%	Very Low Priority
28.7%	Low Priority
40.2%	Medium Priority
11.7%	High Priority
3.5%	Very High Priority

6. In your opinion, if a municipality is actively involved in protecting or promoting historic places within the community, how likely is it that the following outcomes would result? *Please circle one response for each outcome.*

	n	Quite Likely or Very Likely
Increased support for bylaws or policies to protect/promote historic places	325	39.7%
Revitalization of older areas and/or neighbourhoods	319	20.1%
Waste reduction, including reduction in landfill waste	322	12.1%
Increased property tax revenues	320	10.0%
Job growth within the community	321	9.0%
Reduction in energy use	320	8.8%

7. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements. *Please circle one response for each statement.*

	n	Agree or Strongly Agree
Historic places are a source of pride for residents	329	58.7%
Residents appreciate the value of historic places in our community	330	48.5%
It is difficult to find trades/contractors to work on historic places	325	45.2%
Historic places in our community attract tourists	329	40.7%
Our community has a lot of volunteers who protect or promote local historic places	327	28.1%
In our community, more historic places are being re-used than demolished	323	26.6%
It is easy for people to find information about historic places in our community	328	22.9%
It is easy to find information on how to protect or promote historic places	328	20.4%
Residents understand the importance of historic places to the local economy	328	12.8%
Historic places in our community attract new businesses	327	7.3%

8. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements. *Please circle one response for each statement.*

	n	Agree or Strongly Agree
Municipalities need more financial support to adequately protect local historic places	334	81.1%
Tourism Saskatchewan does a good job of helping **promote** local historic places	329	52.6%
Saskatchewan government does a good job of helping **protect** local historic places	331	34.7%
Saskatchewan government does a good job of helping **promote** local historic places	330	33.3%
The municipal government does a good job of helping **protect** local historic places	330	27.6%
Federal government does a good job of helping **protect** local historic places	327	26.6%
Municipal government does a good job of helping **promote** local historic places	328	25.0%
Federal government does a good job of helping **promote** local historic places	326	24.5%
There is a lot of collaboration between our municipal government and local businesses to protect and promote historic places	326	17.5%

9. Please rate your level of agreement regarding how each of the following factors has limited your municipality's ability to protect or promote local historic places. *Please circle one response for each potential factor.*

	n	Agree or Strongly Agree
Lack of municipal financial resources	325	78.8%
Lack of external financial resources (e.g., federal, provincial, or private)	319	72.4%
Lack of municipal staff resources	324	71.3%
Lack of knowledge or expertise within the community	324	45.7%
Little or no volunteer capacity within the community	324	36.4%
Lack of public interest	323	31.0%
Lack of support by local municipal council	321	28.3%
Other (respondents identified other factors such as lack of historic sites, lack of support from corporations, etc.)	23	17.4%

10. Listed below are areas of activity that a municipality can undertake to protect or promote historic places.

Please indicate how useful it would be for municipal staff, other heritage workers and volunteers to receive training or assistance in each of the following areas. *Please circle one response for each area.*

	n	Quite Useful or Very Useful
Identifying and obtaining financial assistance to protect or promote historic places	**318**	**71.7%**
Promoting historic places to residents and tourists	**317**	**59.0%**
Finding new ways to use historic places	**310**	**58.4%**
Engaging residents in protecting/promoting historic places	**316**	**57.3%**
Rehabilitating, restoring, or preserving historic places	**315**	**56.5%**
Developing policies or procedures to protect historic places	**315**	**49.2%**
Prioritizing the actions needed to protect historic places	**313**	**48.2%**
Researching and determining the heritage value of historic places	**315**	**47.0%**
Identifying and documenting existing heritage resources	**301**	**45.5%**
Developing a plan to protect historic places	**315**	**42.2%**

11. Please select all of the sources that your municipality uses to promote its historic places. *Please ✓ all that apply.*

36.5% (n=323) Roadside signage or displays
34.5% (n=325) Internet/website
32.9% (n=325) Printed brochures or guides
26.9% (n=323) Tourism Saskatchewan (e.g., website, brochures, maps, etc.)
23.0% (n=322) Guided tours
16.7% (n=324) Newspaper or magazine advertising or articles
7.8% (n=268) Other (respondents identified other sources such as awards programs, tradeshows, etc.)
6.2% (n=321) Workshops, forums, or other events
3.7% (n=324) Radio or television

Section 2: Historic Places Initiative and Provincial Resources

The Historic Places Initiative (HPI) is a partnership between the Federal, Provincial and Territorial governments that works to promote the protection and conservation of historic places.

1. Prior to this survey, were you aware of the Historic Places Initiative (HPI)? *Please ✓one response.* **(n=333)**

23.4% Yes **76.6%** No

Developed as part of the Historic Places Initiative, the Canadian Register of Historic Places is an online, searchable database containing information on places that have been formally recognized as having historic value by a municipal, provincial or the federal government.

2. Prior to this survey, were you aware of the Canadian Register of Historic Places? *Please ✓one response.* **(n=330)**

30.3% Yes **69.7%** No *(**If No**, skip to question 3)*

2a) If **Yes (n=98)**, has anyone in your municipality (e.g., municipal staff, elected officials, volunteers, etc.) used the Canadian Register of Historic Places? *Please ✓one response.*

26.5% Yes **27.6%** No **45.9%** I Don't Know

2b) If the Register was used **(n=30)**, for what purpose was it used? *Please ✓all that apply.*

- **56.7%** To find out information about historic places in your local municipality
- **53.3%** To learn more about protecting historic places
- **43.3%** To find out information about historic places outside of the municipality
- **20.0%** As a resource for cultural tourism
- **16.7%** As a community awareness tool
- **10.0%** Other (respondents identified uses such as assistance with evaluating proposed alterations, to educate others, etc.)

The *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places* was developed as part of the Historic Places Initiative; it offers guidance when planning for, intervening in and using historic places.

3. Prior to this survey, were you aware of the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*? *Please ✓one response.* **(n=325)**

24.3% Yes **75.7%** No *(**If No**, skip to question 4)*

3a) If **Yes (n=78)**, has anyone in your municipality (e.g., municipal staff, elected officials, volunteers, etc.) used the *Standards and Guidelines*? *Please ✓one response.*

34.6% Yes **30.8%** No **34.6%** I Don't Know

3b) If the *Standards and Guidelines* were used **(n=27)**, for what purpose were they used? *Please ✓all that apply.*

51.9% As a resource for regulating alterations to a designated heritage property
44.4% Providing heritage conservation advice to members of our community
40.7% As a guide when making alterations to a historic place(s)
25.9% Developing heritage policies or procedures
3.7% Other (included uses such as an information source)

3c) In your municipality, have the *Standards and Guidelines* been officially adopted, by policy or bylaw, to guide the regulation of alterations to historic places? *Please ✓ one response.* **(n=41)**

2.4% Yes **73.2%** No **24.4%** I Don't Know

Saskatchewan Heritage FOUNDATION

The Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation provides financial support to heritage projects at the provincial and community level that seek to conserve, research, interpret, develop and promote Saskatchewan's diverse heritage resources.

4. Prior to this survey, were you aware of the Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation (SHF)? *Please ✓one response.* **(n=310)**

53.9% Yes **46.1%** No

Conserving Your Historic Places - A Guide for Communities was developed by the Saskatchewan Ministry of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport (formerly Culture, Youth and Recreation) as a resource for community leaders and officials to help them protect or promote historic places.

5. Prior to this survey, were you aware of *Conserving Your Historic Places - A Guide for Communities*? *Please ✓ one response.* **(n=326)**

36.2% Yes **63.8%** No (*If **No**, skip to SECTION 3*)

5a) If **Yes (n=116)**, has anyone in your municipality (e.g., municipal staff, elected officials, volunteers, etc.) used *Conserving Your Historic Places - A Guide for Communities*? *Please ✓ one response.*

23.3% Yes **34.5%** No **42.2%** I Don't Know

5b) If the *Guide* was used ***(n=30)***, what was it used to assist with? (*Please ✓ all that apply).*

- **50.0%** Designating a historic place as a Municipal Heritage Property
- **36.7%** Assessing and/or describing the heritage value of a place
- **26.7%** Recognizing a historic place (with a plaque, cairn, sign, brochure, website, etc.)
- **20.0%** Developing heritage plans
- **16.7%** Promoting historic places
- **13.3%** Making a list of places in the community that have heritage value
- **10.0%** Managing and regulating designated heritage properties
- **10.0%** Monitoring or evaluating actions regarding the protection/promotion of historic places
- **6.7%** Other (no additional uses were specified)
- **3.3%** Developing heritage programs

Section 3: Saskatchewan's Heritage Property Act

Saskatchewan's *Heritage Property Act* provides for the preservation, interpretation and development of certain aspects of historic places in Saskatchewan.

1. Prior to this survey, were you aware of Saskatchewan's *Heritage Property Act*? *Please ✓ one response.* **(n=337)**

65.9% Yes **34.1%** No

Through Saskatchewan's *Heritage Property Act*, municipalities may establish Municipal Heritage Advisory Committees (MHAC) to advise and assist council with local heritage issues. These are volunteer committees made up of three or more members appointed by council. As well, two or more municipalities may cooperate to form a joint MHAC.

2. Do you have a Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee in your municipality? *Please ✓ one response.* **(n=333)**

3.0% Yes, we have our own MHAC
0% Yes, we have a joint MHAC with another community
88.9% No
8.1% I Don't Know

2a) If **No (n=277)**, would your municipality be interested in creating a Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee? *Please ✓ one response.*

9.4% Yes **22.0%** No **68.6%** I Don't Know

The *Heritage Property Act* empowers Saskatchewan municipal governments to designate places in their community as Municipal Heritage Property. Designation provides formal recognition and legal protection to the place.

3. Prior to this survey, were you aware that historic places could be **designated as Municipal Heritage Property**? *Please ✓ one response.* **(n=336)**

73.5% Yes
25.9% No (*If **No**, skip to SECTION 4*)

3a) If **Yes (n=244)**, does your municipality have any historic places that have been **designated as Municipal Heritage Property**? *Please ✓ one response.*

34.0% Yes, properties have been designated within the past 10 years
23.0% Yes, but the properties were designated over 10 years ago
34.8% No (*If **No**, skip to question 3f*)
8.2% I Don't Know (*If **I Don't Know**, skip to question 3f*)

3b) If **Yes (n=139)**, how many historic places have been **designated as Municipal Heritage Property**?

Mean: 3.08; Median: 2.00 - Number of historic places (*If '0', skip to question 3f*)

3c) What proportion of these **designated** places is at risk of being unused or demolished within the next 10 years? *Please ✓ one response.* **(n=153)**

6.5% A large majority (i.e. more than 75%)
3.9% The majority (i.e. 50% to 75%)
5.2% The minority (i.e. 25% to 50%)
9.8% A very small amount (i.e. less than 25%)
68.0% None that I am aware of
6.5% I Don't Know

3d) Does your municipality **regulate changes** to historic places **designated as Municipal Heritage Property**? *Please ✓ one response.* **(n=160)**

28.8% Yes **52.5%** No **18.8%** I Don't Know

3e) Does your municipality **monitor the condition** of historic places **designated as Municipal Heritage Property**? *Please ✓ one response.* **(n=158)**

38.0% Yes **52.5%** No **9.5%** I Don't Know

3f) If your municipality **has not designated** properties in the past 10 years, please rate your level of agreement that each of the following factors have prevented your municipality from designating a historic place as a Municipal Heritage Property. *Please circle one response for each potential factor.*

	n	Agree or Strongly Agree
Lack of municipal staff resources	123	55.3%
Property owners are not interested	123	34.1%
Designation is too restrictive for developers or owners	121	32.2%
It costs too much money	121	31.4%
Our municipality is not interested	125	27.2%
Other (a few respondents identified factors such as lack of places, lack of knowledge about the process, etc.)	19	21.1%
The designation process is too complex	120	20.8%
The designation process takes too long	119	17.6%

Section 4: Other Historic Places

1. Aside from designation as a Municipal Heritage Property, has your municipality recognized any of its historic places in other ways (with a plaque, cairn, signage, listing in a brochure, etc.)? *Please ✓ one response.* **(n=334)**

46.7% Yes
40.1% No (*If **No**, skip to question 2*)
13.2% I Don't Know (*If **I Don't Know**, skip to question 2*)

1a) If **Yes (n=157)**, has your municipality recognized any of its historic places in the following ways? *Please ✓ all that apply.*

84.7% On-site plaque, sign or cairn
31.2% Listing in a brochure or other publication
28.7% Placing on a website
16.6% Off-site signage (e.g., street/road signs, billboards, etc.)
5.7% Giving the owner an award or citation
1.9% Other (included displays in RM office, images on letterhead, etc.)

1b) Does your municipality have criteria for recognizing historic places? *Please ✓ one response.* **(n=153)**

10.5% Yes **66.7%** No **22.9%** I Don't Know

1c) If **Yes (n=16),** do these criteria include any of the following? *Please ✓ all that apply.*

75.0% Religious significance
75.0% Social or cultural significance
75.0% Age of place
68.8% Theme or connection of the place to a significant person or event
62.5% Rarity or uniqueness
62.5% A unique or outstanding example of an architectural or building style
6.7% Other (respondents identified other criteria such as usage, integrity, etc.)

2. Does your municipality regulate changes to historic places that are **not** designated as a Municipal Heritage Property? *Please ✓ one response.* **(n=330)**

3.0% Yes **72.7%** No **24.2%** I Don't Know

Section 5: Incentives and Projects

Saskatchewan's *Heritage Property Act* enables a municipality to provide grants, loans, tax relief or other forms of assistance to those organizations which will assist in the development or appreciation of historic places.

1. Prior to this survey, were you aware that Saskatchewan's *Heritage Property Act* enables municipalities to provide grants, loans, tax relief or other forms of assistance to organizations that protect or promote historic places? *Please ✓ one response.* **(n=335)**

   36.7% Yes **63.3%** No

2. **In the first column,** please indicate whether your municipality has ever **been asked to provide** any of the following types of financial assistance to support the protection or promotion of historic places. *Please circle one response for each type of assistance.*

	n	Yes	No	I Don't Know
Grants	323	20.1%	54.8%	25.1%
Loans	316	3.8%	71.2%	25.0%
Tax Relief or Tax Abatement Program	316	18.4%	58.2%	23.4%
Reduction to or waiving of utilities	316	10.4%	66.5%	23.1%
Other One-Time Funding	320	15.6%	59.4%	25.0%
Other (respondents identified other incentives such as annual funding)	164	6.1%	62.2%	31.7%

In the second column, please indicate whether your municipality has **ever provided** any of the following types of financial assistance to support the protection or promotion of historic places in your community. *Please circle one response for each type of assistance.*

	n	Yes	No	I Don't Know
Grants	274	16.8%	56.9%	26.3%
Loans	260	2.3%	71.9%	25.8%
Tax Relief or Tax Abatement Program	267	16.9%	58.4%	24.7%
Reduction to or waiving of utilities	265	10.6%	66.4%	23.0%
Other One-Time Funding	274	15.7%	59.1%	25.2%
Other (respondents identified other incentives such as annual funding)	137	5.8%	65.0%	29.2%

3. How much money has your municipality spent to protect or promote historic places in the past year? **(n=319)**

   82.4% Did not spend any money

   17.6% Spent at least some money

   Of those who spent at least some money **(n=56)**, the average was: **Mean: $5,814.93; Median: $1,000.00.**

4. Do you expect the amount of money your municipality spends on protecting or promoting historic places to decrease, stay the same or increase during the next THREE years? Please ✓one. **(n=308)**

   5.5% Decrease

   75.6% Stay the Same

   18.8% Increase

5. Aside from financial incentives, municipalities may provide in-kind contributions (e.g., non-monetary services, goods, etc.) to protect or promote historic places.

   Has your municipality ever provided any of the following in-kind contributions to protect or promote historic places? *Please ✓all that apply.* **(n=328)**

   38.4% Labour

   32.9% Site clean-up or waste removal

   20.4% Equipment

   12.8% Building materials or supplies

   11.3% Professional services (advertising, website development, etc.)

   9.8% Office space or supplies

   9.1% Other materials and supplies

   6.0% Other (respondents identified other contributions such as providing a facility, grounds maintenance, road construction, etc.)

6. Listed below are types of projects that have been undertaken to protect historic places.

Please rate the priority of each type of project in order to prevent historic places in your municipality from being unused or demolished in the next 10 years.

	n	High Priority to Very High Priority
Repairs to building envelope (e.g., roof, windows, painting, siding, doors)	**269**	**41.6%**
Structural upgrades (e.g., foundation, joists, beams)	**259**	**26.3%**
Mechanical upgrades (e.g., electrical, plumbing, heating/cooling)	**261**	**22.2%**
Landscaping (either for historic authenticity or to enhance drainage)	**263**	**16.0%**
Security measures (e.g., fire suppression, theft or vandalism prevention)	**261**	**15.7%**
Hiring professional expertise (e.g., architectural, engineering, project planning)	**261**	**9.2%**
Asbestos removal	**252**	**9.1%**
Other (respondents identified projects such as constructing a fence, grounds maintenance, etc.)	**62**	**1.6%**

7. In the past 10 years, has anyone in your municipality applied to an external funding source or agency (e.g., federal, provincial, private) for support to protect or promote historic places? *Please ✓one response.* **(n=331)**

16.3% Yes **37.8%** No **45.9%** I Don't Know

7a) If **Yes (n=54)**, in the space below, please identify the funding agencies or programs to which you have applied.

Name of Agency, Program and/or Source:

The most frequently cited responses were:

1) **Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation (n=11);**
2) **Canada Celebrates Saskatchewan/Saskatchewan Centennial (n=7); and**
3) **Community Sponsors (n=5)**

Section 6: Municipal Planning

Local municipalities develop general land use or comprehensive plans to guide community planning, development, land use and municipal services. In Saskatchewan, an **Official Community Plan** identifies council's objectives for development in the municipality.

1. Does your municipality have an **Official Community Plan** that is used to guide land use/development activities. *Please ✓one response.* **(n=334)**

   26.6% Yes **64.1%** No **9.3%** I Don't Know

   1a) If **Yes (n=88)**, does this Official Community Plan include any aspects related to the protection or conservation of historic places? *Please ✓one response.*

   25.0% Yes **56.8%** No **18.2%** I Don't Know

2. Some municipalities have developed stand-alone plans to protect or promote one or more historic places.

   Does your municipality have any of the following types of plans to protect or promote one or more historic places? *Please circle one response for each type of plan.*

	n	Yes	No	I Don't Know
Community-wide heritage resource management plan	320	1.9%	84.7%	13.4%
District or Neighbourhood heritage resource management plan(s)	320	1.2%	86.2%	12.5%
Site specific heritage resource management plan(s)	320	6.2%	81.2%	12.5%
Informal or unwritten 'heritage resource management plan(s)'	322	7.8%	77.3%	14.9%
Other (none of the respondents specified other types of plans)	110	1.8%	82.7%	15.5%

2a) If **Yes to any (n=8)**, please indicate whether your municipality used any of the following resources in the process of developing any plan(s) related to protecting or promoting historic places. *Please ✓ all that apply.*

- **(n=0)** Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada
- **(n=2)** Conserving your Historic Places - A Guide for Communities
- **(n=3)** Website or other documents from the Ministry of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport (formerly Culture, Youth and Recreation)
- **(n=2)** Ministry staff (Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport)
- **(n=0)** Other provincial government agencies
- **(n=0)** Federal government
- **(n=3)** Heritage organizations
- **(n=2)** External consultant or contractor
- **(n=2)** Other (included things such as public consultation)

3. Has your municipality adopted policies or bylaws for the reuse, rehabilitation or protection of historic places (designated Municipal Heritage Properties and/or non-designated historic places)? *Please ✓ one response.* **(n=323)**

17.6% Yes **68.4%** No **13.9%** I Don't Know

4. Listed below are potential groups and organizations (e.g., boards, associations, committees) that may be active in protecting or promoting historic places within your municipality.

Please indicate how active the following heritage organizations are in protecting or promoting historic places within your community? *Please ✓ one response for each type of group or organization.*

	n	Group Does Not Exist	Not Active	Somewhat to Very Active	I Don't Know
Local museum	314	43.6%	4.1%	49.7%	2.5%
Friends of a historic site	307	62.2%	5.9%	19.9%	12.1%
Historical society	298	62.4%	6.7%	18.5%	12.4%
Genealogical society	296	72.3%	4.7%	8.1%	14.9%
Local archives	299	62.2%	8.4%	17.1%	12.4%
Community/economic development	304	45.4%	8.9%	37.8%	7.9%
Tourism	307	46.9%	6.2%	37.5%	9.4%
Individual volunteer(s)	310	19.0%	6.1%	65.5%	9.4%
Other (no additional responses provided)	54	68.5%	0.0%	13.0%	18.5%

5. Are any of the following people involved in protecting or promoting historic places in your municipality? *Please ✓ all that apply.* **(n=323)**

   48.3% Individual volunteer(s)
   35.3% Individual(s) from **heritage** group(s) or organization(s) (e.g., local museum, historic site(s), etc.)
   21.4% Municipal elected official
   19.5% Individual(s) from **other** group(s) or organization(s) (e.g., tourism, community development, etc.)
   14.6% Other municipal staff
   8.0% Local business person(s)
   7.4% Municipal staff dedicated to heritage planning
   3.7% Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee members
   3.6% Other (none of the respondents identified other people who were involved)
   1.2% External consultant or contractor

6. Including yourself, how many part-time and full-time municipal staff (paid by the municipality), who are regularly involved in protecting or promoting historic places, are there in your municipality? *Please enter a number in each of the two spaces below. If zero, please enter 0.*

   Regularly means at least once per week during a season or for a certain period of the year.

   25.1% (n=295) had at least one full-time paid municipal staff
   The average number of full-time staff was: **Mean: 1.4; Median: 1.0**

   20.7% (n=275) had at least one part-time paid municipal staff
   The average number of part-time staff was: **Mean: 1.5; Median: 1.0**

7. Municipalities can use resources (e.g., staff, websites and other materials) from many different groups or organizations to help with the protection or promotion of historic places.

If you were to seek assistance for the protection or promotion of historic places, how likely is it that you would use resources from each of the following groups or organizations? *Please circle one response for each group/organization.*

	n	Quite Likely to Very Likely
Government of Saskatchewan	**306**	**71.9%**
Tourism Saskatchewan	**300**	**67.3%**
Federal government	**297**	**57.6%**
Local heritage organization(s) (e.g., museum, historical society, archives, etc.)	**297**	**49.5%**
Local contractor or consultant	**287**	**31.7%**
Non-profit heritage organization(s)	**280**	**29.3%**
Contractor of consultant from outside of the community	**282**	**19.5%**
Local Chamber of Commerce	**272**	**15.1%**
Other (none of the respondents identified other resources)	**29**	**3.4%**

Section 7: Demographics

Finally, we would like to ask you a few questions about yourself. The data will be kept strictly confidential. This information will be used to better understand groups of respondents.

1. Are you: (*Please ✓ one*) **(n=321)**

   72.9% Female
   25.5% Male
   1.6% Prefer not to say

2. Which of the following best describes your current status as an employee of the municipality? *Please ✓ one.* **(n=324)**

   5.9% I am not an employee of the municipality
   59.0% Full-time municipal staff
   25.3% Part-time municipal staff
   9.9% Municipal elected official

   2b) If you are an employee of the municipality, please indicate how many years you have worked in a paid position with the municipality? **(n=276)**

   Number of Years: **Mean: 10.2; Median: 7.0**

3. Do any of the following describe your current status? *Please ✓all that apply.* **(n=319)**

   29.8% Individual volunteer
   15.0% Other (no additional responses provided)
   11.6% Individual from **other** group or organization (e.g., tourism, community development, etc.)
   8.8% Individual from a **heritage** group or organization (e.g., local museum, historic site)
   6.0% Local business person
   1.3% Municipal Heritage Advisory Committee member
   0.6% External consultant or contractor

Individuals might spend more or less time working on activities related to protecting or promoting historic places depending on the season or time of year.

4. **During May to September**, approximately how many hours in a **typical week** are you **paid** to work on activities related to protecting or promoting historic places? *Please enter the number of hours in the space below.* **(n=295)**

   15.9% spent at least some time – **mean: 6.2 hrs; median: 2.0 hrs**

5. **During October to April**, approximately how many hours in a **typical week** are you **paid** to work on activities related to protecting or promoting historic places? *Please enter the number of hours in the space below.* **(n=294)**

   12.2% spent at least some time – **mean: 7.0 hrs; median: 1.0 hrs**

6. **During the past year,** approximately how many hours did you spend **volunteering (not paid)** on any activities related to protecting or promoting historic places. *Please enter the number of hours in the space below.* **(n=293)**

   37.5% spent at least some time – **mean: 35.9; median: 10.0**

7. What is the highest level of education that you have completed? *Please ✓ one.* **(n=319)**

   1.9% Some high school
   10.3% Secondary (high) school graduation or equivalent
   12.5% Some university or college (no degree)
   56.7% Post-secondary certificate or diploma
   12.5% Bachelor's degree(s) (e.g. B.A, B.Sc., LL.B)
   6.0% Graduate or professional degree(s)

8. Are you an Aboriginal person, that is, First Nations, Métis, or Inuit? *Please ✓ one.* **(n=318)**

   3.5% Yes
   94.7% No
   1.9% Prefer not to say

9. Which of the following statements best describes the population of your municipality? *Please ✓ one.* **(n=329)**

   68.4% Up to 500 people
   24.6% Between 500 and 2,000 people
   4.0% Between 2,000 and 5,000 people
   0.9% Between 5,000 and 10,000 people
   1.2% Between 10,000 and 30,000 people
   0.3% Between 30,000 and 50,000 people
   0.6% Over 50,000 people